

The purpose of this amendment is to provide responses to Request for Information received from prospective offerors. The questions and answers are provided below and all offerors are required to acknowledge receipt of this amendment when submitting their proposal:

1. We intend to submit a proposal to the subject solicitation, and wish to make the government aware we are a certified HUBZone small business entity, and currently registered as such in SAM. We believe FAR part 19 is applicable to this solicitation; that there are no exclusions as outlined in FAR 19.1304; and that we are therefore entitled to the 10% price evaluation preference outlined in FAR 19.1307.

**Does the government concur with our understanding?**

**Response:** Yes, the government concurs with the understanding that a certified HUBZone small business entity is entitled to the 10% price evaluation preference in accordance with FAR 19.1309(b). The box at FAR Clause 52.219-4, Notice of Price Evaluation Preference for HUBAone Small Business Concerns is checked under FAR 52.212-5.

2. The Solicitation Section M evaluation factor #1 requests documentation demonstrating offeror is an OEM certified source for overhaul, repair, and / or modification of engines types listed in the solicitation SOW. Factor #2 requests documentation demonstrating offeror is an OEM certified facility. The documentation requested by these two factors is one-in-the-same for both factors.

**Does the government anticipate separate documents/certifications? How will this be evaluated?**

**Response:** Offerors' proposal shall clearly demonstrate that both the offerors' facility and the offeror are OEM certified, regardless of whether these capabilities are demonstrated via submission of one document or two separate documents. The two evaluation factors will be evaluated on a "pass/fail" basis as indicated in the solicitation.

3. In Section L (Instructions to Offerors), we could find no instructions about what information the government expects to see in each proposal volume. Volume I (Executive Summary), Volume II (Technical Proposal), and Volume III (Past Performance) seem self-explanatory; however, para L-00 I, 1.0(f) state the past performance questionnaires shall be sent to appropriate POCs with instructions for them to return to the Contracting Officer. **Therefore, what should offerors put in Volume III? What does "Contract Documentation" mean for Volume IV? What does "Business" mean for content of Volume V? What is the difference between "Contract Documentation" of Volume IV and "Contract Information" in section B?**

**Response:** The proposal shall be clear, concise, and shall include sufficient detail for the evaluators to effectively evaluate the validity of stated claims. The proposal should not simply rephrase or restate the Government's requirements but rather shall provide convincing rationale to address how the Offeror intends to meet the stated requirements. The content and page size and format of electronic copies must be identical to the hard copies. Electronic copies must be submitted in recordable CDs. If files are compressed, the necessary decompression program must be included. The electronic copies of the proposal shall be submitted in a format readable by Portable Document Format (PDF), Microsoft (MS) Office Word 2007, MS Office Excel 2007, MS Office Project 2007, and MS Office Power Point 2007, as applicable. In the event of any discrepancies between the hard copies and the electronic copies of the proposal, the hard copies will be used for evaluation.

In Volume I (Executive Summary), the Offeror shall provide a concise narrative summary of the entire proposal and highlight any key or unique features. The salient features should tie in with Section M evaluation factors. If any portion of the work is provided by a subcontractor(s), the Executive Summary shall describe how the prime offeror will manage subcontractor(s), and the work that will be performed by subcontractor(s).

In Volume II (Technical Volume), the Offeror shall provide as specifically as possible the actual methodology they would use to meet or exceed the minimum performance or capability requirements of each technical factor.

In Volume III (Past Performance), the Offeror shall provide information on a minimum of three (3) contracts

that are recent and relevant to the effort described in the Statement of Work (SOW) and provide points of contacts as references for verification. A minimum of three (3) past performance references shall also be provided for each proposed major and/or critical subcontractor. The Offeror shall submit Past Performance information on contracts that they consider most relevant and recent to the proposed effort.

In Volume IV (Contract Documentation), the Offeror shall provide all information pertinent to the solicitation such as acknowledgement of amendments, any exceptions to solicitation requirements, etc.

In Volume V, (Business), the Offeror shall provide any pertinent company information that the Offeror considers relevant to the solicitation such as purchasing system, estimating methodologies, accounting practices, billing systems, etc.

Sections A through D under Table 2.2 are deleted in their entirety.

4. The solicitation schedule of supplies calls for Cost Reimbursable CLINs, which are each for "Over and Above" costs. Offerors could unfairly "cherry pick" data to base an estimate on without knowing more about the specific condition of each engine. **How does the government intend to evaluate these CLINs?**

**Response:** Cost Reimbursable CLINs are now changed to "To be Determined (TBD)". Refer to Price Evaluation in Section M.5(b) for Firm Fixed Priced (FFP) CLINs.

5. Section L does not address qualifications of "proposed personnel", however this is an evaluation factor in Section M (Factor 3). We have 100's of pages of training documentation, however this would exceed the allotted Tech volume page limit. In addition, Honeywell, the OEM, does not provide certification, and in fact hires us to provide both training and certification to OEM standards. **How does the government wish to see this demonstrated? How will this factor be evaluated?**

**Response:** Section M, Factor 3 is revised as follows:

**“(3) FACTOR 3: QUALIFICATIONS OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL**

**EVALUATION CRITERIA:** Provide documentation demonstrating offeror’s proposed technicians have Honeywell (OEM) approved, current training and heavy overhaul experience on T53 /T55 series engines, associated technical publications, and offerors quality systems.”

6. The engine types specified in the contract and SOW are military engines (the "L" in the type designation signifies military). However, the SOW para 3.5.1.3 and para 10.1.2 both required the use of FAA Form 8130-3, or other FAA airworthiness forms be used to document the engines airworthiness. The FAA forms are not allowed to be used on military engines. As a certified OEM service center we are required to issue a Certificate of Conformance. The authority to issue this certificate is based on our certification from the OEM. **Would the government clarify this requirement, or please consider removing this requirement from the contract SOW?**

**Response:** See revised Statement of Work (SOW), Atch 1 dated 14 July 2016.

7. In SOW para 3.14.3, it states the contractor "shall use only Honeywell certified new or Honeywell certified overhauled replacement parts". However, there may be a misunderstanding regarding "overhauled" replacement parts. Honeywell does not overhaul any parts, nor do they certify any overhauled parts. They rely on certified service centers, such as Mint Turbines, to certify an overhauled part to the OEM's Overhaul manual. The act of the service center providing the certification that a part meets the OEM overhaul requirements should be considered the same standard as the OEM providing this certification. **Would the government clarify this requirement, or please consider amending the contract SOW to allow the OEM-certified Service Center to use overhauled parts as long as they provide documented confirmation the part conforms to the OEM Overhaul manual?**

**Response:** See revised Statement of Work (SOW), Atch 1 dated 14 July 2016.

8. In SOW para 3.16.1 requires documentation of oil analysis (IAW the Army Oil Analysis Program (AOAP) after the completion of Test Cell/Engine Runs; however, the OEM does not require oil analysis in their overhaul manuals, or in the OEM certification program for test cells, nor for the certification of service centers in general. **Would the government please consider removing this requirement from the contract SOW?**

**Response:** The requirement remains as stated in SOW.

9. The pricing of an overhaul on the engine types specified in this solicitation is highly dependent on the number of hours the customer requires between overhaul (Time Between Overhaul: TBO). The T53-L-703 engine can be overhauled to a 3,000 hr TBO, or a 5,000 hr TBO, and this difference has a direct correlation to Life Limited Components and their cost. We have found nowhere stated in the SOW an explicit statement on the TBO requirement. **Would the government please clarify if the overhaul requirement is for 3,000 hr or 5,000 hr TBO? Would the government please clarify if the conversion requirement is for 3,000 hr or 5,000 hr TBO? Please note that the 5,000 hr conversion is significantly more expensive.**

**Response:** See revised Statement of Work (SOW), Atch 1 dated 14 July 2016.

10. In SOW para 3.11.1 it states "Once authorization to proceed has been given to execute the actions specified by the CO in section 3.9 (item #3.9.1.1 and item #3.9.1.2 only) of this SOW, the Contractor shall have a maximum of 180 calendar days from the time of notification to accomplish the tasks necessary to pick-up, repair, overhaul, modify, and ship the affected equipment back to the INL Logistics Center in Melbourne, Florida. It should be noted that in this calculation the government has included both pick up and transit time to contractor facility, but has excluded inspection and quote time. In addition, this paragraph conflicts with the 180 days in para 4.2, which states delivery back to the government is 187 days after receipt of the engine at the contractor's facility. **How can authorization to proceed be given prior to inspection/quote? How can the inspection/quote occur prior to picking up the engine and transporting to contractor facility? What is the remedy for the contractor if the government delays responding to the quote? Would the government please clarify what this requirement is and when the clock starts?**

**Response:** The authorization to proceed (ATP) initiates the pick-up time for the contractor. After picking up the engines, the contractor will have the responsibility to provide a quote to the government for the repair; with a request for a minimum response time of one week or more. Upon receiving government response, the contractor shall follow up with repair, overhaul, etc. The time allotted to accomplish this entire process is 180 days. The 187 days in SOW para 4.2 includes 7 days shipment transit time for the government to receive the repaired/overhauled item. Any delay on part of the Government in responding to the quote beyond the requested time will be added to the 180-day time period.

11. We have noticed that the page totals for each volume are very low. All volumes added together are do not appear to be in excess of 300 pages. The total of which could all easily fit into one 1.5" binder. The instructions L-001, 2.2.3 it requires each volume be separately bound in a 3-ring binder. This seems excessive for volume which contains 5 pages maximum. The total binder count equals 21. **Would the government please consider revising L-001 Table 2.2, allowing offerors to consolidate their proposals into one binder (original) and 5 copies (6 binders total)?**

**Response:** Yes, offerors may consolidate all five volumes into one hard copy binder (original) and three (3) copies (4 hard copy binders) + one (1) CD.

12. In Section M of the RFP, we see the list of M.2 (Non-Price Evaluation Factors and Evaluation Criteria) which do not appear to be part of the Technical Evaluation, yet there is no information about how these factors are evaluated or the consequences of not passing one or more of the M.2 Factors. **Are the M.2 Factors evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis? Would the government please clarify what happens if an offeror can not successfully or adequately pass one or more of the M.2 Factors?**

**Response:** Note that Section M.1, Basis of Award states, “award will be made to that responsible Offeror whose total price evaluated in accordance with paragraph M.5 of this solicitation is the lowest and whose proposal meets or exceeds all technical and past performance evaluation criteria.” The “(non-cost factors)” in M.1 is revised to read “(non-price factors)”. The Technical Evaluation factors in M.2 will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis (Acceptable or Unacceptable) as stated in M.3. Therefore, a proposal must meet or exceed all technical and past performance criteria in order to be selected for award as stated in M.1.

13. There is a clear requirement for the offeror to be a Honeywell certified service center. However, there appears to be a lack of clarity regarding accessories and/or the Fuel Control Units (FCU) and Overspeed Governors (OSG). **Can any (or all) accessories and/or the FCU/OSG repair or overhaul work be accomplished by a non-Honeywell certified vendor?**

**Response:** See revised Statement of Work (SOW), Atch 1 dated 14 July 2016.